MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 27, 2023
FROM: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D.
       Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
SUBJECT: Temporary Use of DPS Pending Revisions Related to Narrative Word Limits

Very recent changes in UPS 210.000 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Procedures”), section II.B.4, allow for Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) narrative lengths of up to 1,500 words, i.e., an increased narrative length maximum. An audit of Department Personnel Standards (DPS) has revealed that many existing DPS explicitly maintain a 1,000-word limit on narratives for a candidate’s WPAF.

The CSUF Academic Senate passed resolution ASD 23-67 (“Resolution to clarify USP 210.000 regarding narrative length”). The resolution resolved that the permitted lengths of narratives be 1,500 words for all departments.

After consulting with Faculty Affairs and Records, I have determined that revisions of DPS are in order, if not already being worked on. Until those DPS revisions are formally approved, the currently approved DPS are in effect, except that the former, 1,000-word limits cannot be used (i.e., are out of compliance with campus policy).
According to Article 15.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement: Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.

According to University Policy Statement 210.002 (6/3/2021 version), Section III.A.: • Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions. • All Departmental Personnel Standards require the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Vice President for Student Affairs for counselor faculty). • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall normally be formally reviewed by the department as part of the program performance review or an accreditation process. • Student Opinion Questionnaire forms must be included as an attachment to Departmental Personnel Standards.
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I. INTRODUCTION.

The procedures adopted by the Department of Biological Science of the College of Natural Science and Mathematics for evaluating and recommending faculty for retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) decisions and other personnel matters conform with policies outlined in the CSU-Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and University Policy Statements (UPS) 210.000 and 210.002. Each faculty member shall meet the requirements detailed in this Departmental Personnel Standards, the CBA, and UPS 210.000. Thus, each new faculty member shall be presented with a copy of the DPS by the Department Chair upon joining the faculty. Faculty members shall be responsible for examining UPS 210.000 and 210.002 as they prepare documentation for RTP decisions or periodic reviews and are encouraged to review the current version of the CBA. Throughout this document the word “shall” indicates mandatory action; the words “may” or “should” indicate permissive action, but “should” includes an element of expected action.

I.A. Goals.

I.A.1. Program Excellence. The Department of Biological Science is committed to the goal of establishing and maintaining an academic program of the highest quality for the purpose of providing the students at the University with an excellent education in biological science. The Department recognizes that the key to a quality program is faculty excellence and, thus, expects a high level of competency in both Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, as well as a strong commitment to Service. The purpose of this DPS is to ensure the excellence of the biology faculty by setting forth guidelines for faculty hiring and subsequent evaluation of faculty performance.

I.A.2. Nature of the Evaluation Process. Evaluation of faculty is an arduous, but necessary process. The diverse facets of professionalism that comprise excellence in a faculty member are entwined so tightly that for purposes of evaluation separation is difficult if not impossible. Thus, the categories developed in this document create artificial separations of the collection of attributes and activities expected of each faculty member. Nevertheless, the reviewers (section I.B.4.) must use these categories to make judgments about the level of performance of each faculty member as a whole. The reviewers shall: (1) exercise fairness, wisdom, and compassion in making judgments, (2) develop constructive evaluations and reports that recognize accomplishments, (3) contribute to the development of informal improvement plans as necessary, (4) safeguard the future excellence of the Department by ensuring excellence in its faculty members, and (5) align their evaluation with the spirit and intention of the criteria established in the DPS.

I.A.3. Positive Role of Review. The Department believes that the best way to foster a superior program is to support and assist its faculty in becoming excellent teacher/scholars. For this reason, the document and its policies should be viewed as supportive and constructive, having the goal of maintaining or raising the quality of the Department and its programs. The review process
provides an opportunity for the recognition of areas of strength and achievement of a faculty member as well as the recommendation of areas for potential improvement.

I.B. Retention, Tenure and Promotion.

I.B.1. Importance. The granting of tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Professor are the most important personnel decisions that the Department can make. The granting of tenure recognizes significant achievement and the strong potential for continued contribution to the goals of the Department. The promotion to Professor recognizes the development of leadership roles in the discipline. As detailed in UPS 210.000, written requests by the faculty member shall determine whether early tenure and promotion considerations shall be initiated; tenure consideration is automatic during the sixth probationary year review.

I.B.2. Retention. The Department recognizes that retention of high-quality faculty is the primary way to achieve its objectives of establishing and maintaining program excellence. The personnel evaluation process is a means to maximize the likelihood of a faculty member successfully meeting this goal.

I.B.3. Evaluation. In making recommendations for personnel decisions, three categories are evaluated: (1) Teaching Performance, (2) Research and Scholarly and Creative Activity (RSCA), and (3) Professional, University, and Community Service. Primary consideration shall be given to Teaching Performance and Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity, which together constitute about 80% of the importance of the evaluation; Professional, University and Community Service shall be given secondary consideration and make up the remaining 20% of importance. These percentages represent relative weights to be assigned qualitatively by the DPC and shall not be directly quantified.

I.B.4. Definition of Reviewers. In this document, the term “reviewer” shall include evaluators at all levels of review as described in UPS 210.000, “the Departmental Personnel Committee, the Department Chair (except when the Chair is ineligible), the Dean (or equivalent), the Faculty Personnel Committee (as appropriate), the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President.”

I.B.5. Portfolio. The Portfolio shall include an up-to-date and complete curriculum vitae, evidence of performance in the categories defined in Section I.B.3. for all of the years of review (including prior years of service if those were granted at the time of original appointment), and other elements as specified in UPS 210.000.

I.B.5.a. Portfolios in Probationary Years. The department follows the typical portfolio review schedule described on the Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) website. In brief:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probationary year</th>
<th>Portfolio type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prospectus only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Full review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abbreviated review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Full review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Abbreviated review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Full review (for tenure and promotion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prospectus.** During the first probationary year, the Prospectus is completed and included in the Portfolio submitted during the Probationary Year 2 review. During subsequent years, the Prospectus may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

**Full Review.** Full performance reviews typically occur during probationary years 2, 4, and 6, and require the submission of a full portfolio reflecting achievements in three areas:

1. Teaching  
2. Scholarly and Creative Activity  
3. Service

These reviews are **CUMULATIVE** and require data and documentation of activities always from the date of hire to the date of submission for the RTP Portfolio.

**Abbreviated Review.** Abbreviated reviews typically occur during probationary years 3 and 5 and only require the submission of:

- An updated C.V., documenting significant activities in Teaching, RSCA, and Service since the date of hire at CSUF  
- SOQs completed during the time period between the submission due date for the RTP Portfolio compiled for the last full-review and the submission deadline for abbreviated reviews  
- Grade Distributions from the same time period as the SOQs

**I.B.5.b. Post-Tenure Portfolios.** Portfolios for tenured faculty shall be constructed as specified in UPS 210.020 for post-tenure reviews and as specified in this document for promotion to professor.

**I.B.6. Mentors and Prospectus for Probationary Faculty.** First year probationary faculty will be assigned one or more Mentors before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester. The Mentor(s) will provide guidance, advice and support to the probationary faculty member during preparation of a Prospectus during the first year as outlined in UPS 210.000. Probationary faculty will include the Prospectus in their Portfolio.
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I.B.7. **Timetable.** Retention, tenure and promotion decisions shall occur according to the timetable established in UPS 210.000 and announced by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Faculty shall be informed of the dates for submission by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records.

I.B.7.a. **Early Promotion Eligibility and Review Schedules.** Faculty shall normally be considered for tenure during their sixth probationary year, regardless of the rank at which they were appointed. The granting of tenure before the sixth year shall be considered “early tenure”.

**Early Tenure.** Faculty members shall normally be considered for Tenure during their sixth probationary year, irrespective of their appointed rank. Conditions for early tenure are outlined in UPS 210.000. Consideration for Early Tenure may be requested by a faculty member after having completed a minimum of one year of probationary service and before completing the fifth probationary year. Requests for an Early Tenure decision must be submitted in writing to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records by the deadline indicated in UPS 210.000.

**Early Promotion to Associate Professor.** As per UPS 210.000, a probationary faculty member shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time as the tenure decision. Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may be considered for early promotion after completing at least one year of service in rank at CSUF.

To be considered for Early Promotion without tenure, a faculty member must apply in writing to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records no later than the end of the second week of classes of the Fall semester.

I.B.7.b. **Promotion to Professor Eligibility and Review Schedule.** Promotion of a tenured faculty member shall normally occur during their fifth year of service as an Associate Professor; faculty who have not completed four years as an Associate Professor may request early promotion (see UPS 210.000). A faculty member in their fifth year of service as Associate Professor may request in writing to Faculty Affairs and Records that they not be considered for promotion, in which case evaluation shall continue according to UPS 210.020 Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty.

The department considers promotion to professor to be a significant step, recognizing contributions to the discipline, to the department, and to the university. Thus, the department expects that faculty members being considered for promotion to professor should perform at or above the level expected for recommendation for tenure in the areas of teaching performance and research and other scholarly and creative activity and perform above the level expected for recommendation for tenure in the area of professional, university and community service. For a tenured faculty member being considered for promotion to professor, the time period of review shall be the time since the last full review that resulted in a recommendation for tenure.

I.B.7.c. **Post-Tenure Review Schedule.** Tenured faculty shall undergo periodic review every five years according to UPS 210.020. The Portfolio shall include 1) an up-to-date, curriculum vitae that
includes information about teaching, scholarly/creative activities and service, and indicates activities completed during the evaluation period; 2) SOQ statistical summaries and comments for all courses taught in the five-year period; 3) a summary (maximum of two-pages) outlining the most significant achievements during the period of review and the faculty member’s goals regarding teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service for the next five years.

II. TEACHING PERFORMANCE

II.A. Department Course Offerings

The Department of Biological Science offers courses at the undergraduate and graduate level. At the undergraduate level, courses are offered to majors and non-majors. Courses offered to biology majors include: (1) lower and upper-division core courses required of all majors, (2) upper-division gateway or foundation courses required for specific concentrations, (3) advanced courses offered as upper-division electives to majors (some with laboratory or field components included), and (4) faculty-supervised undergraduate research. Courses offered for majors may also be required by other science programs, e.g., biochemistry, environmental studies, and those seeking biology teaching credentials. Courses for non-majors include several lower- and upper-division courses fulfilling requirements in the general education program, and lower- and upper-division courses required for other majors, minors, and programs. Graduate level studies principally include advanced specialty courses, seminars, and faculty-mentored graduate research.

II.B. Expectations for Teaching Performance

It is the intention of the Department to have each faculty member strive for excellence in Teaching Performance. Thus, the Department seeks continuous improvement in Teaching Performance among faculty at all levels. Each faculty member should provide evidence of high academic standards in their classroom and currency in the subjects being taught. In addition, all faculty should have clearly articulated goals and objectives for teaching and learning. These goals should reflect the faculty member's efforts to deal with new developments in biology, the educational process in general, and advancements in classroom-presentation tools. The goals should also be sensitive to student retention and the changing patterns of the student body with respect to preparation, background, gender, culture, and ethnicity. The Department expects that the faculty member’s success in addressing these goals and objectives will be assessed as described below.

II.C. Documentation of Teaching Activities

The level of Teaching Performance shall be determined by evaluation of the Teaching portion of the Portfolio. This portion of the Portfolio shall include the following:

1. Teaching Performance Narrative (II.C.1)
2. SOQs (II.C.2)
3. Classroom Observations (II.C.3)
4. Required Documentation (II.C.4 through II.C.7)

These four components shall be used to evaluate an individual’s pedagogical approach (see II.D), which includes teaching activities that accommodate diverse learning styles, culturally sensitive approaches, involvement with students and direct participation in their mastery of information, concern for learning success as evidenced by self-reflection and outcome assessment, other documentable teaching activities, as well as evidence of ongoing professional development as a teacher, and maintenance of currency in the discipline.

A priori, no one of these four components are intended to dominate the overall evaluation. Furthermore, the Department wishes to make it clear that, even though the SOQ scores are important as a measure of student evaluation, the fact that they are the only quantitative component does not mean that they are more important, and they shall not be given a dominant role based solely on their quantitative nature.

II.C.1. Teaching Performance Narrative. The Teaching Performance Narrative is the primary form of self-evaluation. During preparation of the narrative the faculty member shall address their performance over the review period, reflect on successes and failures, and revise goals and objectives for future classes. The narrative should be cumulative and not necessarily treat each semester separately. If the same course has been taught several times, a discussion of the progressive development of that course should be included. The teaching narrative is also expected to provide evidence of pedagogical approaches.

The self-evaluation narrative shall cover the following topics:

II.C.1.a. Classroom Teaching Performance. This self-appraisal is an assessment of the degree to which course goals and objectives have been met, using required and supplemental materials as evidence. Reflection on feedback provided by peer classroom observations should be included. The use of equipment, media, library holdings, personnel and facilities that support teaching, and measures of improvement in student cognitive skills, job performance, retention, and similar parameters may also be addressed. The narrative may include selected comments from students, peers, personal perceptions, and any other information that may help the reviewers understand achievements in this important area of teaching. The following questions reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching Performance Narrative: What specific changes have I made that help me meet my goals and objectives? What have I done to improve the clarity and usefulness of the verbal and written materials that students receive? What have I done to encourage the students to become self-directed learners? What innovative teaching and evaluation methods did I try and were they successful? What is my response to comments on the student opinion questionnaires? What changes have I made in response to peer feedback? What are my goals and objectives for the next review period? How have I addressed challenges in instructional design or pedagogy that may have occurred in my teaching? How do I share my excitement for biology with my students? How have I diversified my teaching styles to accommodate diverse learners? How has student performance changed over time? How have I engaged my students in active learning? What can I do to improve my...
teaching dynamic? How has my approach to teaching reduced the achievement gap in my classes?

II.C.1.b. Development of Curricula. Another important area of Teaching Performance is the development of new courses or the extensive modification of existing courses. Experienced faculty should be more involved than new faculty in this type of teaching activity, but both groups, no doubt, should be engaged in curricular development. Teaching Performance Narratives should discuss the pedagogical importance of the new course(s) or course modifications developed during the review period. The following questions reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching Performance Narrative: How does the course enhance the departmental curriculum? What important aspect of biology does it explore? What innovation in instructional design and/or pedagogy will be employed in the course? How do modifications made to existing courses strengthen the goals of the course and contribute to the student learning outcomes?

II.C.1.c. Supervision of Student Research. Research is the process of doing biology, not just learning about it. The skills of hypothesis development and testing, experimental design, laboratory or field techniques, data analysis, and communication of results are essential to a professional biologist. For this reason, an important activity of the biology faculty is the mentoring of student researchers. Many undergraduate and all graduate students engage in independent research in the laboratories of biology faculty members. The close student-faculty association and the passage of laboratory/field expertise is difficult to chronicle, but its importance cannot be overemphasized. The narrative should concisely discuss the role of the faculty member in these activities. The following questions reflect the kinds of issues that could be addressed in the narrative and shall not be construed by any reviewer as requirements for each and every Teaching Performance Narrative: How do I maintain currency in my discipline? How do I approach the process of helping the student become a thinking biologist? In what ways do I help my students learn the process of experimental design? What are the objectives of the student research project? How does the student’s study fit in with the appropriate body of knowledge? Have I encouraged and provided opportunities for the student to communicate their findings to the scientific community? Have I encouraged and provided opportunities for students from underrepresented groups to engage in research? Contributions to graduate research are also made via faculty involvement on thesis committees and assistance with student use of instruments or techniques. These contributions should be documented as well.

II.C.1.d. Advising and Mentoring Activities. Molding the career of a biology student requires close interaction between faculty and students. The Department considers advising and mentoring of students to be an important aspect of Teaching Performance. This process may take three forms: (1) academic and career advising, (2) mentoring and role modeling,
and (3) supervising student research. Discussion of these advising and mentoring activities shall be included in the Teaching Performance Narrative.

II.C.1.e. Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher and in the Discipline. To be effective educators, faculty members must strive to improve their classroom performance. In addition, they must maintain currency in the biological sciences, particularly in those areas that reflect their primary teaching responsibilities. Participation in pedagogical seminars and workshops, attendance at scientific conferences, and interactions with colleagues in the discipline are evidence of such professional development.

II.C.2. Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs). SOQs are the primary mechanisms for student evaluation of Teaching Performance. The SOQs shall have quantitative and qualitative components. Each shall consist of questions deemed relevant to the different types of classes.

All course SOQs (statistical summaries and raw data/comment reports) shall be submitted for each semester during the review period. Other forms of student evaluation may be submitted as deemed appropriate by the faculty member.

II.C.2.a. Types of SOQs. Because of the diversity of course offerings, the Department divides courses into four categories for instructor evaluation, each assessed with a distinct form: (1) lecture courses, (2) lecture/laboratory/field courses (when lab is taught by the lecture instructor), (3) laboratory/field courses or laboratory/field components of courses (if the lab is taught by a different instructor), and (4) seminar and seminar-like courses.

II.C.2.b. Levels of Performance. In the quantitative portion of the SOQs, students shall react to statements about the instructor by ranking them from Outstanding (“4”) to Unacceptable (“0”).

II.C.3. Classroom Observations. Classroom or laboratory observation is one of the best ways for each DPC member to develop first-hand knowledge of the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. For untenured, probationary faculty, at least four observations per year should be performed by members of the DPC, ideally distributed two per semester (unless prohibited by class schedule conflicts). For tenured associate professors, two observations should be performed per academic year by members of the DPC. For full professors, observations may be performed once per academic year by members of the DPC.

During class visitations, DPC members shall observe and assess the learning environment within the classroom (both the instructor and the classroom environment). These visits are also a mechanism to provide constructive feedback to the instructor.

The Classroom Observation Forms for each semester of the review period shall be submitted in the Portfolio appendix. All observations, including observations of synchronous and asynchronous online instruction, shall be conducted in accordance with UPS 210.080.

II.C.4. Course Materials. The course materials submitted are expected to reflect the nature of the course itself. The Department expects courses to be presented at the highest level of quality with rigor appropriate for the level of the students.
Material from all courses taught during the review period shall be submitted in the Portfolio appendix in support of the Teaching Performance Narrative, according to UPS 210.000. For courses taught several times, multiple samples may be submitted to demonstrate the progressive development of the course, but otherwise materials should be limited to a single representative sample.

1. Syllabi and topic schedule provided to students that meet all department and university requirements.
2. Representative assignments.
3. Representative copies of examinations and other types of assessments along with an explanation of how these were administered (i.e., in-class, take-home, open-book, etc.).
4. Representative handouts provided to the students in support of the course.

II.C.5. Grade Distributions. In accordance with UPS 210.000, grade distributions shall also be included in concert with departmental grade point averages.

II.C.6. Suggested Supporting Materials. The faculty member may include additional documentation of classroom materials and professional development in teaching such as:

1. Samples of lecture notes, presentations (e.g., PowerPoint) and/or recorded lectures (audio/video).
2. Samples of original audio-visual materials, and/or access to course management websites.
3. Samples of original study aids.
5. Evidence of attending workshops, symposia, etc. designed to help faculty improve teaching performance.
6. Evidence of attending conferences and/or other interactions with colleagues designed to maintain currency in the discipline.
7. Evaluation of textbooks used, and changes made.
8. Evidence of student performance such as exam averages.
9. Samples of student learning assessments.
10. Samples of instructor-graded assessments/assignments
11. Evidence of efforts to teach to an increasingly diverse student population.
12. Other evidence as deemed appropriate by faculty member, including activities described in II.C.8.

II.C.7. Other Teaching-related Activities for faculty members with service credit.

1. Faculty members with service credit shall include data and materials generated during that time (see II.C.1-6).
II.C.8. **Other Teaching-related Activities for Promotion to Professor.** For promotion to Professor, documentation of productive contributions in other teaching-related areas is required. Below is a list of possible activities, which may not be complete and does not denote any order of importance or value.

While the activities below would be evaluated in portfolios for retention, tenure, and promotion to associate professor, pre-tenure faculty are encouraged to consider their overall progress in both Teaching and Scholarly Research and Creative Activity before taking on any of the additional activities below:

1. Curricular development as in II.C.1.b (e.g., departmental approval of a new course, implementation of new courses or components of courses, revision of an existing course for alternate modality of instruction).
2. Incorporation and assessment of innovative teaching techniques or strategies in lectures or laboratories.
3. Completion of textbooks, laboratory manuals, etc.
4. Funding of an intramural or extramural grant for teaching equipment, development of teaching materials, creation of fellowships or institutes at CSUF or of educational interactions with other institutions, or other similar activities.
5. Organization of symposia in support of the teaching objectives of the Department.
6. Productive contributions in activities such as core laboratory/field course coordinator, seminar coordinator, or similar activities that are outside of the faculty’s regular teaching load in a given semester or academic year.

II.D. **Evaluation of Level of Teaching Performance**

The Level of Teaching Performance shall be based on ratings of four categories: (1) Teaching Narrative, (2) Student Evaluation by SOQs, and (3) Classroom Observations and (4) Required Documentation and Suggested Supporting Materials. *Each of these forms of evaluation shall be of equal importance in determining the Level of Teaching Performance.*

1. Each reviewer evaluates categories 1-4 above (II.C) and assigns a rating for each category of “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair” or “Unacceptable”, and determines an overall rating with supporting comments.
2. For the DPC evaluation, the committee combines individual DPC member evaluations and assigns a committee rating.

Below are the components that compose the Evaluation of Level of Teaching Performance rating:

1. **Individual Evaluation of Teaching Narrative.** To obtain an Individual Evaluation of Teaching Narrative, each reviewer shall read and evaluate the Teaching Narrative (the self-evaluation component of the Portfolio) as defined above in Section II.C.1. (Teaching Performance Narrative). Based on criteria such as the thoroughness of the narrative, the quality of self-evaluation, the responsiveness to peer and student comments, efforts to continue
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improvement as needed, and evidence of the characteristics of teaching dynamic, each reviewer shall rate the Teaching Narrative as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, or “Unacceptable” depending on its overall quality.

(2) Individual Evaluation of Student Opinion Questionnaires. SOQs have two components—qualitative and quantitative as defined above in Section II.C.2 (Student Opinion Questionnaires). Reviewers shall look for attributes of the pedagogical approach within student comments.

When evaluating SOQs, reviewers should be cognizant that biases affecting SOQ scores and comments do exist. These include, but are not limited to, class size, gender, race, nationality, sexual orientation, and age.

Furthermore, reviewers should be aware that quantitative scores might anchor an assessment, which is a form of cognitive bias. The overall rating shall not be overly influenced by the quantitative scores. Both the qualitative and quantitative components shall be given equal weight when determining an Overall SOQ Rating.

(a) Qualitative component. Each reviewer shall evaluate the written comments on the SOQ forms for each class taught during the review period.

(b) Quantitative Component. Each reviewer shall evaluate the student ratings average for each class over the period of review based on the quantitative questions of the SOQs. The quantitative scale used by the students on the SOQ forms is within the ranges: “Outstanding” (3.50-4.00); “Very Good” (2.50-3.49); “Good” (1.50-2.49); “Fair” (0.50-1.49); “Unacceptable” (below 0.5).

(c) Overall SOQ Rating. The Overall SOQ Rating is the discretionary combination of Qualitative and Quantitative Components. Each reviewer shall rate the overall SOQ components as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, or “Unacceptable”.

(3) Individual Evaluation of Classroom Observations

(a) Each reviewer shall evaluate “Classroom Observation Forms” (II.C.3) and look for attributes of the pedagogical approach within Classroom Observations.

(b) When appropriate, each reviewer should evaluate the “Classroom Observation Forms” for evidence of improvement/progression of instructional design and content delivery over time.

(c) Each reviewer shall rate the Class Observations as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, or “Unacceptable” depending on its overall quality.

(4) Supporting Documentation

(a) Each reviewer shall read materials submitted as defined above in Section II.C.4 through II.C.8 for each class as appropriate, and evaluate their contributing role toward the overall pedagogical goal for the course.
Departmental Personnel Standards

(b) Context for the content and use of supporting documentation should be provided in the Teaching Narrative.

(c) Each reviewer shall rate the submitted materials and supporting documentation as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, or “Unacceptable” depending on its overall quality.

II.E. Teaching Performance Recommendations for RTP by Faculty Rank

Teaching assignments are made by the Chair based on departmental needs. Expectations for teaching performance may vary with different teaching assignments. For example, instructors in large, lower division or non-major lectures do not have the opportunity for personal contact with each student that small, upper division, major seminar-type classes would have, and SOQs may reflect the differential. Since instructional design and pedagogical approach may differ based on course assignment, classroom observation reports may also reflect that difference.

II.E.1. Teaching Performance-Recommendation in Probationary Years. Each reviewer shall determine a Level of the Teaching Performance of a probationary faculty member as defined in Section II.D (Evaluation of Level of Teaching Performance). This level will be used to determine a recommended action as found in Section V.

Probationary Year 2 Full Performance Review:

● This is the first full review for probationary faculty.
● First and second year probationary faculty are expected to develop the basic skills required for effective communication in the classroom and laboratory.
● A second-year performance review resulting in “Fair” evaluation for Teaching should result in a recommendation for a full performance review for year 3.
● An overall reviewer evaluation of “Unacceptable” in Teaching Performance should result in recommendation for a terminal year.

Probationary Years 3 and 5 Abbreviated Review:

● Reappointment for another probationary year is automatic and evaluations are advisory. Nevertheless, performance should be on track for tenure.

Probationary Year 4 Full Performance Review:

● Because the fourth probationary year covers three years of activity, it should show growth and progress toward tenure; thus, many of the expectations for tenure should have been met by this time.
● A fourth-year performance review resulting in “Fair” evaluation for Teaching should result in a recommendation for a full performance review for year 5.
● An overall reviewer evaluation of “Unacceptable” in Teaching Performance should result in a recommendation for a terminal year.

II.E.2 Teaching Performance-Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor. Each reviewer shall determine a Level of the Teaching Performance of a probationary faculty member
as defined in Section II.D (Evaluation of Level of Teaching Performance). This level will be entered on the Recommendation Matrices found in Section V to determine a recommended action.

Probationary Year 6 Full Performance Review:

- For the granting of tenure, the Department expects the faculty member to be a well-rounded teacher who exhibits proficiency at several levels of classroom instruction and who uses a variety of teaching techniques with skill.
- The reviewers must determine that the faculty member:
  - Has demonstrated an ability to contribute to the teaching goals and objectives of the Department.
  - Shows evidence of ongoing professional development as a teacher and in the discipline.

II.E.3 Teaching Performance - Recommendation for Promotion to Professor. For promotion to Professor, the Department encourages the faculty member to develop a leadership role in Teaching Performance and expects the faculty member to have maintained an overall rating of “Very Good” or better in Teaching Performance according to the criteria discussed in Section II.D (Evaluation of Level of Teaching Performance) and in agreement with the Matrix indicated in section V.C. In accordance with UPS 210.002, materials to be considered for promotion to Professor should be those generated after October 2 of the sixth probationary year.

The faculty member shall also have contributed to the Department objectives in other teaching-related activities discussed in Section II.C.8.

When a probationary Associate Professor is requesting simultaneous promotion to Professor and the granting of tenure, all conditions for tenure and promotion to Professor apply. And in this situation, activities at CSUF shall be weighted most heavily; evidence of continued high-level performance is expected.

II.E.4 Teaching Performance - Recommendation for Early Tenure and Early Promotion to Associate Professor. The Department expects performance that exceeds the minimum required for tenure and promotion. According to the UPS 210.2002, early tenure and promotion should be granted to faculty that have a pattern of strong overall performance. To achieve such performance, faculty should have an evaluation of Outstanding in either Teaching or RSCA activities, plus a rating of “Very Good” in the other two areas. See recommendation matrices in Section V.

II.E.5 Teaching Performance - Recommendation for Early Promotion to Professor. The Department expects performance exceeds the requirement for promotion to professor. According to UPS 210.002, performance of faculty applying for early promotion shall be at the level of Excellent. Excellent overall ratings will be achieved by a combination of “Outstanding” in either Teaching or RSCA activities, plus “Very Good” in the other two categories. See recommendation matrices in Section V.
II.E.6 **Teaching Performance-Review of Tenured Associate and Full Professors.** The Department will follow requirements established in the UPS 210.020 Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for tenured Associate and Full Professors.

Associate Professors who are submitting a portfolio for promotion to Professor shall follow the recommendations in II.E.3.

III. **RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY (RSCA).**

III.A. **Department Responsibility**

At the university level, excellence in scholarship is the foundation for excellence in Teaching Performance. This is particularly true in a broad discipline like biology where knowledge grows more rapidly than textbooks can be published and where productivity in field- or laboratory-based activities are the essence of scholarship. Faculty are required to establish and maintain a CSUF-based research program that includes undergraduate and graduate students at CSUF under the faculty member’s direct supervision.

III.B. **Definition of RSCA in Biology.**

No matter whether studies are directed at developing a fundamental understanding of biological processes or at creating innovative ways to help students learn about them, *original research is the basis for scholarship* in the discipline. As a result of original research, faculty members become experts in a sub-discipline of biology. It is this expertise that qualifies them to offer courses in the Department’s curriculum and to mentor students doing research in their laboratories.

RSCA includes:

III.B.1. **Publication.** Publication is an important step in any scientific investigation, and, ultimately, is the basis upon which the lasting value of the work shall be judged. Generally, manuscripts that receive rigorous peer evaluation prior to publication will be of greater value to the advancement of knowledge in the discipline. Nevertheless, this document recognizes that rigorous peer review may vary from multi-reader evaluation to inspection by a single editor, and that publications receiving little, or no peer review may be important contributions. All publications will require careful evaluation by the reviewer to determine their importance, and it is incumbent upon faculty to provide supporting evidence to facilitate evaluation. Unpublished research, ranging from a near-complete manuscript to a collection of partially analyzed data, constitutes evidence of on-going activity.

III.B.2. **Grant/Contract Writing.** Funding of research activities through the receipt of contracts and grants is fundamental to the research success of a faculty member. Faculty are expected to seek funding for RSCA from intramural and extramural funding agencies through competitive grants reviewed by peers; extramural grants are weighted more heavily than intramural grants. CSUF-based grants are considered intramural; CSU-based grants are considered intramural under most circumstances. Types of grants that may be included are those in support of original research and
those that increase the capacity for original research via infrastructure or human resource training (including instrumentation, personnel, contracts, biology education, and student training). It is incumbent upon faculty to provide supporting evidence to facilitate evaluation of all grants, contracts not subject to peer review, student training grants, and instrumentation grants. For example, this might include evidence of PI and co-PI grant responsibilities and description of field-specific contract-granting agencies and their contract award process.

III.B.3. **Presentations.** Presentation of papers and seminars to learned bodies is an important way to communicate research findings and is a natural outcome of the research process. Presentations are particularly important for communicating work in progress and for receiving feedback from other workers in the field. Also, presentations are seen as a vehicle by which a faculty member can establish herself/himself as an expert in the field.

III.B.4. **Supervision of Student Research.** The continuity of biology as a discipline is built on the foundation of well-trained students who become productive biologists, i.e., people who do biology. Faculty are expected to involve graduate and undergraduate students in their research programs with the goal of developing the cognitive and manual skills required to investigate biological processes. These include: critical thinking skills required for developing research questions, building hypotheses, and designing sound experimental protocols; technical prowess necessary for performing experiments, making observations and gathering data; analytical skills required for analysis of the data; and communication skills necessary to inform the scientific community of research findings.

**III.C. Documentation and Evaluation of RSCA**

Consistent with the Prospectus and performance in RSCA, reviewers shall evaluate faculty members using the Research Narrative and Additional Required Documentation of RSCA described in this section.

III.C.1. **Research Narrative.** The Research narrative is the primary tool to provide contextual information for documentation (III.C.2) and to self-evaluate RSCA performance. The narrative should consist of a concise discussion of the RSCA that has transpired during the review period. The faculty member should use the narrative to put their RSCA into perspective with other work in the field and emphasize the most important aspects of their research findings, with attention to contributions made by undergraduate and graduate students. The narrative should be used to clarify how research achievements are significant to the building of and the success of their CSUF-based research program. This is especially important for multi-institution and multi-author manuscripts and grants; regional and discipline specific grants, contracts, and programs that reviewers may not be familiar with; and grants that increase the capacity for original research via infrastructure or human resource training. The narrative is an opportunity to specify the role of the faculty member’s CSUF-based research program in the publication(s) and to explain the impact of the grant support on their CSUF-based research program. For instrumentation and student training grants, the contribution of the individual faculty member’s CSUF-based research program on the success of the grant proposal should be addressed.
III.C.2. **Additional Required Documentation.** Below is a list of the RSCA documents to be included in the RTP portfolio. These are listed in descending order of importance. All research products should be listed in standard reference format and documented where necessary as described in the research section under the relevant type of review. Faculty members with service credit shall include data and materials generated during that time.

1. **Primary research papers:** Citations from peer-reviewed publications that represent original contributions to knowledge in biology. Co-authored citations should indicate the contributions of the faculty member to the final product. The greater the involvement of the faculty member, the more heavily weighted the contribution will be in the review process.
2. **Contributions of a synthetic nature:** Citations of review papers, book chapters, books, symposium proceedings and the like that primarily compile, organize and analyze large quantities of material in the field. Co-authored citations should indicate the contributions of the faculty member to the product.
3. **Funding:** Citations should include funded grants and contracts, review panel comments of unfunded proposals, if available, and submitted extramural grant proposals. Co-PIs should indicate the relative contributions they made to the proposal. Funded proposals shall be weighted more heavily than unfunded proposals. Funded and unfunded intramural proposals shall be considered but given lower value. The quality of proposals should be determined by the review panel comments as well as funding status. Size and longevity of successful grants shall be considered.
4. **Textbooks, courseware, patents, and software:** Citations include textbooks and patents. Courseware developed for innovative instruction or software developed for specialized research uses should also be submitted. These contributions shall be evaluated based on originality, creativity and value to the discipline. (Contributions in this area are not encouraged until after tenure has been achieved.)
5. **Technical reports:** Citations of technical reports presented in completion of contracts that have a substantial scholarly value and are not simply a professional exercise. (Contributions in this area are not encouraged until after tenure has been achieved.)
6. **Evidence of presentations at professional meetings:** Citations of published or unpublished abstracts from papers or posters presented at regional, national or international meetings, conferences, or symposia.
7. **Other publications:** Citations of published reviews of books on biology; other publications in the discipline, including unrefereed preprints (e.g., bioRxiv.org).
8. **Unpublished materials:** Manuscripts in preparation; grant proposals in preparation; graduate and undergraduate student reports; compiled and analyzed research data; and the like.

**III.D. RSCA Review and Recommendations for RTP by Faculty Rank**

The Department’s expectation of probationary faculty increases with the increasing years of experience. For RSCA, the most important concern for the first and second probationary years is the construction of the Prospectus (UPS 210.000), the establishment of a functional research laboratory,
recruitment of research students. RSCA expectations will vary with teaching assignment because it is clear that this commitment determines the amount of time available for research. During subsequent years, a higher level of productivity will be expected. Ultimately, it is expected that the faculty member will develop and maintain a CSUF-based research program that will meet or exceed the departmental standard for tenure.

III.D.1. RSCA Reviews and Recommendations during probationary years. Each reviewer shall evaluate the Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activities of faculty being considered for retention in categories as defined below.

Probationary Year 2 Full Performance Review:
- **Outstanding** - There shall be evidence of: (1) the establishment of a working laboratory showing student involvement in research; (2) a peer-reviewed paper submitted, or a significant extramural grant submitted; (3) a contribution from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6; and (4) other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 4-8 (see Section III.C.2).
- **Very Good** - Important contributions that approach the criteria for “Outstanding” and significantly exceed the criteria for “Good” shall be rated as “Very Good”.
- **Good** - There shall be evidence of: (1) the establishment of a working laboratory showing strong potential for student involvement in research; and (2) evidence of significant contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1-8.
- **Fair** - The establishment of a working laboratory with the potential for student involvement in research, but evidence of little other significant activity shall be evaluated as “Fair”.
- **Unacceptable** - Failure to meet the criteria for “Fair” shall be deemed “Unacceptable”.

Probationary Years 3 and 5 Abbreviated Periodic Review:
The reviewer will look for evidence of growth and progress toward tenure. UPS 210.000 requires only the CV to document RSCA, so the CV should contain a comprehensive and annotated list of products from Areas 1-8 in Section III.C.1. These reviews are advisory only and will determine Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory progress toward Tenure.

Probationary Year 4 Full Performance Review:
Because this review covers three years, the reviewer expects to see strong evidence of growth and progress toward tenure.

- **Outstanding** - There shall be evidence from all six of these categories: (1) the maintenance of a CSUF-based research program that involves students; (2) an accepted or published peer-reviewed paper or a significant extramural grant funded; (3) a paper submitted for peer-review or an extramural grant submitted; (4) a paper or grant in development; (5) three contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6; and (6) other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 4-8 in Section III.C.2.
• **Very Good** - Important contributions that approach the criteria for “Outstanding” and significantly exceed the criteria for “Good” shall be rated as “Very Good”.

• **Good** - There shall be evidence of: (1) the maintenance of a CSUF-based research program that involves students; (2) a paper submitted for peer-reviewed publication; (3) a paper in preparation; (4) a significant extramural grant proposal submitted; (5) one or two contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6; and (6) other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 4-8.

• **Fair** - The maintenance of a CSUF-based research program that involves students and that yields high-quality, but unpublished data; and evidence of other contributions from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1-8.

• **Unacceptable** - Failure to meet the criteria for “Fair” shall be deemed “Unacceptable”.

Recommendations for **Probationary Year 2 Full Performance Review**:

- This is the first full review for probationary faculty.
- An overall reviewer evaluation of Fair or higher shall result in a recommendation for retention.
- If the Probationary Year 2 Performance Review results in a “Fair” rating, a full performance review shall be recommended for Year 3. The Full performance review for Year 3 shall be evaluated according to the Year 2 criteria.
- An overall reviewer evaluation of “Unacceptable” in RSCA should result in a recommendation for a terminal year.

Recommendations for **Probationary Years 3 and 5 Abbreviated Review**:

- Reappointment for another probationary year is automatic and evaluations are advisory. Nevertheless, performance should be on track for tenure.

Recommendations for **Probationary Year 4 Full Performance Review**:

- Because the fourth probationary year covers three years of activity, it should show growth and progress toward tenure; thus, many of the expectations for tenure should have been met by this time.
- An overall reviewer evaluation of Fair or higher shall result in a recommendation for retention.
- If the Probationary Year 4 Performance Review results in a “Fair” rating, a full performance review shall be recommended for Year 5. The Full performance review for Year 5 shall be evaluated according to the Year 4 criteria.
- An overall reviewer evaluation of “Unacceptable” in RSCA shall result in a recommendation for a terminal year.

III.D.2. **RSCA-Review and Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.** Each reviewer shall evaluate the Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity of faculty being
considered for tenure in categories as defined below. This level will be entered on the Recommendation Matrices found in Section V to determine a recommended action.

Promotion to Associate Professor occurs with the granting of tenure and uses the same criteria described in this section.

Probationary Year 6 Full Performance Review:

For the granting of tenure, the Department expects the faculty member to have developed a well-rounded CSUF-based research program that encourages and provides for student involvement consistent with the Prospectus. Each faculty member is required to contribute to the knowledge in their area of specialization and, thus, to the discipline in general. Contributions shall be in accordance with areas discussed in Section III.B. Definition of RSCA in Biology and Section III.C. Documentation and Evaluation of RSCA, and specifically indicated below. The quality of the contributions is most important, but the reviewer shall also consider the number of publications. As stated previously, the timing of publication is not critical, but evidence of an on-going research program must be presented.

- **Outstanding** - Important, high-quality contributions from a CSUF-based research program are expected from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1-6 as follows. There shall be: (1) at least three peer-reviewed contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1 or 2, two of which should contain significant primary research; (2) at least one significant extramural grant shall have been funded (Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 3); (3) at least an average of one contribution each year from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6 is expected; and (4) contributions in other Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas commensurate with this level of performance.

- **Very Good** - Important contributions that approach the criteria for “Outstanding” and significantly exceed the criteria for “Good”, shall be rated as “Very Good”.

- **Good** - Valuable contributions from a CSUF-based research program shall have been made from among Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1, 2, 3 and 6 as follows. There shall be: (1) at least two peer-reviewed contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1 (contributions in Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 2 may substitute for one of these, but should contain some primary research); (2) at least one substantive, good quality extramural grant proposal (Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 3) shall have been submitted and two intramural grants shall have been funded if no extramural grant was awarded; (3) an average of one contribution every other year from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Area 6 shall have been made; and, (4) contributions in other Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas commensurate with this level of performance.

- **Fair** - The presence of on-campus research activity that includes contributions from Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity Areas 1 or 2, 3, and 6 meeting some, but not all,
III.D.3. RSCA-Review and Recommendation for Early Tenure and Early Promotion to Associate Professor. The Department expects performance that exceeds the requirements for tenure and promotion. See recommendation matrices in Section V.

III.D.4. RSCA-Review and Recommendation for Promotion to Professor. Each reviewer shall evaluate the Research and other RSCA-related areas of faculty being considered for promotion to Professor in categories as defined below. This level will be entered on the Recommendation Matrices found in Section V to determine a recommended action. In accordance with UPS 210.002, materials to be considered for promotion to Professor should be those generated after October 2 of the sixth probationary year.

- **Outstanding** - It is expected that important, high-quality contributions will have been made from among RSCA Areas 1-5. There shall be at least three contributions in RSCA Areas 1 or 2, at least two of which shall be primary research papers. A contribution in RSCA Area 4 may be considered in substitution for a contribution in RSCA Area 2. One extramural grant (RSCA Area 3) shall have been funded. There shall be at least an average of one contribution per year from RSCA Area 6. Contributions in other RSCA Areas shall be considered.

- **Very Good** - Important contributions that approach the criteria for “Outstanding” and significantly exceed the criteria for “Good” shall be rated as “Very Good”.

- **Good** - Valuable contributions shall have been made in RSCA Areas 1 or 2, and 3 and 6. At least two contributions in RSCA Area 1 or 2, of which one shall be a primary research paper. A contribution in RSCA Area 4 may be considered in substitution for one contribution in RSCA Area 2. One high-quality proposal (RSCA Area 3) shall have been submitted to an extramural agency, and two intramural proposals shall have been funded if no extramural grant was awarded. An average of at least one contribution every other year from RSCA Area 6 shall have been made. Contributions in other RSCA Areas shall be considered.

- **Fair** - The presence of research activity that includes contributions from among RSCA Areas 1 through 6 meeting some, but not all of the criteria for “Good”, and including contributions from among RSCA Areas 7 and 8 may be rated as “Fair”.

- **Unacceptable** - research contributions that fail to meet any of the criteria for “good” shall be rated “unacceptable”.

III.D.5. RSCA-Review and Recommendation for Early Promotion to Professor. Greater emphasis on performance in the category of RSCA shall be given during consideration of applications for early promotion to Professor since promotion to that rank requires evidence of continuing RSCA as
specified in UPS 210.002. For a probationary faculty member at the Associate Professor rank, early promotion to the rank of Professor requires simultaneous consideration for tenure.

III.D.6. RSCA - Review of Tenured Associate and Full Professors. The Department will follow the UPS 210.020 Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for tenured Associate and Full Professors. Tenured Associate Professors are expected to maintain activity in all three areas of evaluation, teaching, RSCA, and service. For promotion in the future, faculty are expected to meet or exceed the requirements for promotion to Professor.

IV. PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.

Faculty members are expected to participate in activities that benefit professional societies and organizations and the University and Community. All faculty members are expected to make consistent, productive contributions to faculty governance, particularly as members of Departmental committees, as part of University service. Other Professional, University and Community Service activities should reflect an individual's interests and capitalize on special expertise or abilities. Involvement in activities that promote and support a particular scientific or educational area is important in establishing a faculty member as part of a larger community of professional scientists and educators. All faculty members are expected to participate in these activities. However, for untenured faculty members, participation in these activities is of secondary importance to establishing proficiency in teaching and to developing a productive research program. Service plays an increasingly important role in evaluating faculty members who are being reviewed for promotion to Professor (see Section IV.G. for evaluation).

IV.A. Service activities. These activities reflect an investment into the profession, University, and community. However, participation in these activities also reflects opportunity and effort. For example, early career faculty may not be eligible for, or may be discouraged from participating in, leadership positions on and off-campus. Many service roles are appointed or elected, and thus some willing faculty may not be able to participate. Similar types of service activities may require different amounts of time or work from faculty. Thus, the department recognizes that defining a ‘meaningful service activity requires consideration of multiple components. Accordingly, all reviewers or peer review committees shall evaluate service activities with respect to three facets: investment, duration, and relevance. See Section IV.D-F for a list of appropriate examples of activities.

IV.A.1. Investment. Investment refers to the effort required for initiation, participation, or completion of a service activity. For example, an activity that requires passive involvement, like attending a workshop, would not rate as highly in investment as taking on a leadership role in the workshop.

IV.A.2. Duration. Duration refers to commitment of time or resources needed for participation in an activity. For example, an activity that spans a single day would not rate as equivalent to extended efforts in the planning for an activity or participation in a sustained initiative.

IV.A.3. Relevance. Relevance refers to the strength of connection between the activity and the University, Department, or field of study. For example, activities that support science
literacy or diversity in STEM would rate higher than participation in a political rally or neighborhood clean-up. Broadly, for retention and tenure consideration, it is important to demonstrate modest and consistent, productive contributions to service.

IV.B. **Curriculum Vitae (CV).** In their CV, faculty members are encouraged to organize the enumeration of service activities according to the categories considered in the DPS (Sections IV.D.-F. Professional, University, and Community Service) and to provide short descriptors to inform all reviewers or peer review committees about the nature of significant activities, including investment, duration, and relevance.

IV.C. **Evaluation of Professional, University and Community Service.** Evaluation of Service shall be made by the faculty member and by all reviewers or peer review committees.

IV.C.1. **Self-evaluation.** In a concise narrative, the faculty member should review the contributions made and the nature of those contributions, including investment, duration, and relevance, in the areas of Professional Service and Service to the University and Community during the period under consideration. If some service activities overlap more than one category, then the narrative should be used to identify the category where the activity belongs. The faculty member should provide a combined rating of themselves based on the evaluation criteria specified below (IV.C.2) and provide a brief justification for the rating in the narrative.

IV.C.2. **Peer Evaluation.** The DPC shall review the body of material submitted as evidence of Professional, University and/or Community Service as indicated by the UPS 210.002. These contributions should be evaluated as “Outstanding”, “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, and “Unacceptable”. The following evaluation criteria shall be used:

- **Outstanding:** Evidence of significant service to the University plus significant service in one other area, with basic contributions to the third area. Very good: Evidence of significant contributions in University service (See IV.E) and basic in Professional service (see IV.D.) and Community service (see IV.F.). Good: Evidence of basic contributions in both University service and Professional service (see IV.D. and IV.E.) or significant contributions in University service OR Professional service. Fair: Evidence of basic contributions in either Professional or University service areas. Unacceptable: Does not meet criteria for basic service in either category.

IV.D. **Types of evidence in support of Professional Service.** Documentation should include dates and titles of the activities described below. This is a list of possible activities, which is not complete. Some distinctions between basic and more significant contributions are noted below, and evaluation in general is based on duration, investment, and relevance (see IV.A).

IV.D.1. **Service as a peer reviewer for professional publications or extramural granting agencies.** Basic professional service includes service as a reviewer of papers for scientific journals and textbooks, or as a reviewer of extramural grant applications for organizations such as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other granting agencies. If no reviews were performed, then evidence of volunteering as a reviewer for
several journals and/or granting agencies should be provided. More significant service as a reviewer is service on review panels of granting agencies.

IV.D.2. **Service to professional societies or organizations.** Basic professional service at meetings includes activities such as judging student presentations, attending society business meetings, or volunteering with a society as a student mentor. More significant contributions in this category include involvement in organizing or chairing meetings, symposia or contributed paper sessions. Participation as a presenter of original research as defined in Section III.B. Definition of Scholarly and Creative Activity should be included under Research and other Scholarly and Creative Activity.

IV.D.3. **Service in an official capacity for professional organizations.** This significant professional service includes activity as an officer, committee chair or committee member in professional societies or organizations.

IV.D.4. **Awards and honors from professional societies or organizations.** Awards or honors presented by professional societies or organizations should be entered as evidence of significant professional service.

IV.D.5. **Service as an editor or member of an editorial board for professional publications.** This is considered significant professional service.

IV.D.6. **Presentation of seminars or lectures at other institutions.** Such presentations are basic professional service but can be significant service if there were several during a review period.

IV.D.7. **Service to public or private agencies.** Such service will be judged as basic or significant based on investment, duration, and relevance (see IV.A.).

IV.E. **Types of evidence in support of Service to the University.** The following list indicates the types of activities considered by the DPC as evidence of Service to the University and Community consistent with the Developmental Narrative. This list is not complete. Some distinctions between basic and more significant contributions are noted below, and evaluation in general is based on duration, investment, and relevance (see IV.A.).

IV.E.1. **Service in governance of the Department, College, and University.** This includes service on standing or ad hoc committees or offices involved in the governance of these units. Basic service includes volunteering or agreeing to serve on department committees. Depending on duration and investment, significant service includes service on College and university committees that meet regularly or assuming leadership of a College or University committee.

IV.E.2. **Participation in department meetings, seminars, and other activities.** Basic service includes attendance at departmental meetings, seminars, workshops, and other activities. Reviewing scholarship applications and applications to the Master’s program. More significant service in this category includes inviting and hosting speakers at departmental seminars or organizing departmental meetings, seminars, or other activities other than ones that receive teaching credits and are evaluated under Teaching Performance.
IV.E.3. **Service in organizing or conducting Department, College, University, or Community functions and activities.** Service on committees or offices involved in planning various functions (e.g., social functions for the Department, Day in Science for the College), mentoring activities sponsored by the College and University, and reviewing proficiency examinations for the University.

IV.E.5. **Service as a sponsor or advisor to student organizations.** This category includes activities such as serving as a reviewer of grants for the Associated Students, serving as adviser for student clubs, and mentoring high school students in science participation programs organized by groups inside of the University.

IV.F. **Types of evidence in support of Service to the Community.** The following list indicates the types of activities considered by the DPC as evidence of Service to the Community consistent with the Developmental Narrative. This list is not complete. Some distinctions between basic and more significant contributions are noted below, and evaluation in general is based on duration, investment, and relevance (see IV.A.).

**IV.F.1. Presentations of lectures delivered to community groups or organizations.** The dates, titles and locations of such lectures should be included for these activities.

**IV.F.2. Service to community groups.** This may include education outreach, activities or fundraising on local boards or in community groups, and participation in community functions such as local non-profit groups, charities, and civic activities. The relevance of this type of community service to the profession as a scientist and educator should be discussed in the Service narrative.

**IV.F.3. Service as a mentor to students from other organizations, such as high schools.** This may include education outreach, participation in local and state science fairs, mentoring high school students in science participation programs organized by groups outside of the University.

IV.G. **Evaluation by Faculty Rank**

**IV.G.1. Evaluation for Retention.** Fair or better: Recommendation for retention. Unacceptable: Retention is not recommended.

**IV.G.2. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.** Good or better: Recommendation for tenure. Fair: Recommendation possible. Unacceptable: Terminal year recommendation.

**IV.G.3. Evaluation for Tenure, for faculty with incoming rank of Associate Professor.** Good or better: Recommendation for promotion. Fair: Recommendation possible. Unacceptable: Terminal year recommendation.

**IV.G.4. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor.** Very Good or better: Recommendation for promotion. Good: Recommendation for promotion is possible. Fair or Unacceptable: No recommendation for promotion.
IV.G.5. **Early Tenure and Early Promotion to Associate Professor.** Very Good or better: Recommendation for early tenure and early promotion. Good, Fair or Unacceptable: No recommendation for early tenure and early promotion.

IV.G.6. **Early Promotion to Professor.** Very Good or better: Recommendation for early promotion. Good, fair, or unacceptable: No recommendation for early promotion.

IV.G.7. **Evaluation of Tenured Associate Professors.** This is dictated by UPS 210.020

IV.G.8. **Evaluation of Professors.** This is dictated by UPS 210.020

**V. RECOMMENDATION MATRICES FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION**

The Action Matrices shown below shall guide the reviewer in making their recommendation.

**V.A. Recommendation for Retention of Probationary Faculty.**

Teaching or RSCA:
- Outstanding to Good: Recommendation for Retention;
- Fair: Recommendation for Retention is possible;
- Unacceptable: Recommendation for Termination (second probationary year review) or a Terminal Year (third through fifth probationary year full review).

Service:
- Fair or better: Recommendation for Retention.
- Unacceptable: Recommendation for Termination (second probationary year review) or a Terminal Year (fourth probationary year review).

During each probationary year review, the reviewer’s evaluation of the Teaching Performance and RSCA performance shall note the progress made toward the eventual granting of tenure. Specific reference about satisfactory progress toward this goal shall be included in a letter from the DPC to the faculty member.

**V.B. Recommendation Matrix for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:**

- This matrix also applies to faculty seeking early tenure and early promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
- This matrix also applies to faculty hired at the associate level seeking tenure
- As described in UPS 210.002, the criteria for recommendation for early tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are that performance in Teaching and RSCA exceed the expectations for tenure.
### V.C. Recommendation Matrix for Promotion to Professor:

- Under unusual circumstances, promotion may be recommended for a faculty member with combined ratings of “Outstanding” and “Fair” or “Good” and “Good” in Teaching Performance and RSCA. However, under such conditions the DPC shall provide thorough explanation in support of its decision.
- This matrix also applies to faculty seeking early promotion.
- As described in UPS 210.002, the criteria for recommendation for early promotion to Professor are that all three areas of review shall be excellent. Excellent is defined below in the legend for the matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSCA</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>UA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommendation for Early Tenure if Service is evaluated as Very Good or better

#### Recommendation for Tenure if evaluation of Service is Good or better; is possible if Service is evaluated as Fair or better

#### Recommendation for Terminal Year
**Departmental Personnel Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Grade</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent-Recommendation for Early Promotion if Service is evaluated as Very Good or better; Recommendation for Promotion if Service is Good or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Recommendation for Promotion if Service is evaluated as Good or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No recommendation for Promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V.D. Evaluation of Tenured Associate and Full Professors
- Periodic Evaluations of Tenured Faculty will follow UPS 210.020.

VI. **The Departmental Personnel Committee.**

VI.A. Composition
VI.A.1. **Number.** The DPC shall consist of five voting members and one alternate. For promotion to Full Professor the peer review committee will consist of, at least, three Full Professors.

VI.A.2. **Terms.** All five voting members shall have two-year terms staggered so that two are elected every other year and three in alternating years. One alternate having a one-year term of office shall be elected each year. The alternate shall become a voting member of the DPC when they replace a DPC member who has become ineligible. If the alternate position is vacated, a new alternate member shall be elected.

VI.B. Elections

VI.B.1. **Timing.** Election of the voting members of the DPC and the alternate shall occur in the spring semester.

VI.B.2. **Announcement.** The election shall be announced two weeks in advance.

VI.C. Eligibility
- All tenured faculty are eligible except as specified by UPS 210.000.

VI.D. Balloting Process

VI.D.1. **Nominations.** The names of all eligible faculty shall be placed in nomination for each position being filled.

VI.D.2. **Votes Required.** Each seat will be filled by the faculty member with a plurality votes (greatest number of votes, but not necessarily a majority).

VI.D.3. **Separate Ballots.** Separate balloting shall be conducted for each vacant seat. The two-year seats shall be filled first, then any one-year seats resulting from a vacancy, followed by the alternate.
VI.D.4. **Tie Votes.** In the event of a tie, a new ballot with those faculty members with an equal number of votes shall determine the appointment to the DPC:

VI.D.4.a. The faculty member with the most votes is elected to the vacant position.

VI.D.4.b. In the event of a tie, this process will be repeated until the tie is broken.

**VI.F. Responsibilities of DPC and the PTRC**

VI.F.1. **Evaluation of Portfolios.** The DPC shall evaluate Portfolios submitted during each cycle of review as specified in Section I.C. Retention, Tenure and Promotion. All eligible DPC members shall review each of these portfolios; in promotion considerations, DPC reviewers shall have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion. In all cases, at least three members of the DPC shall evaluate each portfolio.

VI.F.2 **Evaluation of Post Tenure Review Portfolios.** The Post Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) members are the Department Chair and at least one member of the DPC (UPS 210.020). Individuals undergoing a post-tenure review may not serve on the PTRC. An additional member of the DPC will be required to serve on the PTRC in the event that the Department Chair is undergoing a post-tenure review.

VI.F.3. **Classroom Observation.** The DPC shall conduct classroom observations in accordance with UPS 210.080 and submit “Classroom Observation Forms” for faculty members.

VI.F.4. **Edit Departmental Personnel Document.** The DPC shall review, revise and submit for approval changes to this document as becomes necessary to keep it in compliance with UPS 210.000, UPS 210.002, the CBA and departmental goals and objectives.

VI.F.5. **Other Personnel Business.** The chair of the DPC or their delegate will meet with prospective candidates for tenure-track appointments as part of the interview process. Members of the DPC should be available to answer questions from colleagues regarding the DPS and the RTP process. The DPC chair should participate in any post-review meetings between faculty and the department chair. The DPC shall coordinate University, College, and Department award nominations and conduct other personnel business as requested by the Department Chair or as deemed appropriate by the DPC.
Appendix I.
Al. a. Class observation form

Department of Biological Science
Classroom Observation Criteria

Instructions/guidelines: The objective of peer evaluation is to assess the learning environment within a classroom (during the single-visit “sample”) and to provide a mechanism for constructive feedback to the instructor. Your observations and comments will also be used as part of the evaluation of the instructor’s teaching performance by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC).

Please make an objective observation of the class. Use the prompts provided below as suggestions of what to look for during the classroom visit. These prompts do not represent a definitive list of behaviors for effective instruction or student learning, and we do not expect that every objective will be met in every class meeting or that every prompt will be addressed in the report for each classroom observation session.

Before the class visit, observers are expected to obtain a class syllabus and other course materials deemed relevant by the instructor, and are encouraged to meet with the instructor after the class visit to discuss their observations.

A. The Instructor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did the instructor organize and present course content, concepts, and themes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Learning objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ presented learning objectives for the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ used instruction that supported course learning outcomes and class objectives (refer to syllabus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ presented material appropriate for the level of the course and the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Organization and presentation/treatment of concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ followed a logical, well thought-out plan for teaching course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ provided clear, easily understood explanations for concepts and/or experimental procedures and presented examples to explain concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ linked present content to prior/future course concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ provided pertinent applications of concepts; used examples that applied the concepts in other contexts; discussed ethical (or other) implications of course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Interactions with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Departmental Personnel Standards

- provided clear (unambiguous) responses to student questions and/or directed students to key resources to answer questions
- encouraged students to provide examples to explain concepts; referred students to references where examples could be located
- used various instructional strategies to engage students

B. The Classroom Environment:

How were students engaged in learning?

a. Student behaviors
   - students were attentive
   - students were engaged in thought provoking activities
   - students asked meaningful questions
   - students interacted with peers in meaningful discussion
   - students contributed to classroom discussions

b. Instructor behaviors
   - instructor promoted critical thinking and problem solving
   - instructor directed students to listen and respond to each other
   - instructor recognized students with questions
   - instructor checked for student understanding after answering a question
   - instructor provided relevant resources if question could not be answered
   - instructor encouraged students to ask questions
   - student questions and comments helped determine the focus and direction of classroom discourse
   - instructor demonstrated knowledge of students (e.g., knew names, personal connections such as interests and goals, etc.)

c. Instructor use of curricular techniques or technology
   - instructor effectively used available technology in the classroom
   - instructor made use of technology (e.g., course website, textbook CD) to support learning outside of the classroom (based on information from syllabus)
   - instructor used formative assessment techniques to check for understanding
   - instructor provided opportunities for students to participate in activities
   - instructor recognized diverse learning strategies and varied instruction to meet needs
Departmental Personnel Standards

- instructor provided constructive feedback to students

Approved 22 Sep 2006
Department of Biological Science

Classroom Observation Form

Answer the questions below to summarize the class observation. Provide a copy of the completed form to the Biology Department Administrative Coordinator.

A. The Instructor:

Summarize your observations of the instructor: How did the instructor organize and present course content, concepts, and themes? How effectively did the class meet course objectives? What did the instructor do to promote student learning?

Specific things that the instructor did to contribute to student learning:

Specific things the instructor could do to improve his/her teaching effectiveness or to improve learning in the classroom:

B. The Classroom Environment:

Summarize your observations of the classroom environment: Describe interactions between students and instructor and among students. How engaged were students in learning? How did the instructor use instructional techniques to enhance learning or engage students?

Specific examples of how the instructor engaged students in learning or evidence that the classroom environment facilitated learning:

Specific things the instructor could do to make the classroom environment more conducive to learning:
Departmental Personnel Standards

Al. b. SOQ forms
The results of this questionnaire are important in the evaluation of teaching performance for RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION and POST-TENURE review made by departmental and university personnel committees. They are ANONYMOUS and are reviewed by your instructor only AFTER your grades have been submitted.

**PART 1**: Consists of nine statements pertaining to your instructor's teaching performance. Choose your response according to the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>Insufficient basis to evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Was prepared for lab/field activities.
1.2 Clarified objectives of lab/field activities.
1.3 Was knowledgeable about activities occurring in the lab/field.
1.4 Facilitated learning during lab/field activities.
1.5 Corrected and returned reports, etc., in a timely manner.
1.6 Treated students with respect.
1.7 Overall, how would you rate this instructor?

**2. Elaborate on your responses to PART 1**

2.1 List specific things the lab/field instructor has done especially well.

2.2 List specific things the lab/field instructor could do to improve his or her teaching effectiveness?

Please continue on Page 2
2.3 Were the lab/field manual and other written materials useful in attaining the course objectives?


2.4 Was this a challenging lab/field experience?


2.5 Would you recommend to other students that they take this lab/field from this instructor? Briefly explain.


1. The Instructor

The results of this questionnaire are important in the evaluation of teaching performance for RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION and POST-TENURE review made by departmental and university personnel committees. They are ANONYMOUS and are reviewed by your instructor only AFTER your grades have been submitted.

PART 1: Consists of nine statements pertaining to your instructor's teaching performance. Choose your response according to the following scale.

A = Outstanding
B = Very Good
C = Good
D = Fair
E = Unacceptable
BLANK = Insufficient basis to evaluate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Elaborate on your responses to PART 1.

2.1 List specific things the instructor has done especially well


2.2 List specific things the instructor could do to improve his or her teaching effectiveness.


Please continue on Page 2
### Class Climate: Biological Science Lecture

**2. Elaborate on your responses to PART 1. [Continue]**

2.3 Was the textbook helpful in attaining the course objectives? Explain.

2.4 Was this a challenging course? Explain.

2.5 Would you recommend that other students take this course from this instructor? Briefly explain.
The results of this questionnaire are important in the evaluation of teaching performance for RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE review made by departmental and university personnel committees. They are ANONYMOUS and are reviewed by your instructor only AFTER your grades have been submitted.

Please complete BOTH parts of your form.

PART 1 consists of 13 statements pertaining to your instructor's teaching performance. Using a soft pencil, choose your response according to the following scale.

A = Outstanding
B = Very Good
C = Good
D = Fair
E = Insufficient basis to evaluate

1.1 Demonstrated knowledge of the subject
1.2 Showed interest in the subject
1.3 Was prepared for lecture/discussion
1.4 Delivered the material in a clear and logical manner
1.5 Presented a well-organized course with clear objectives
1.6 Provided effective and timely feedback on student performance
1.7 Was prepared for each lab/field activity
1.8 Helped clarify the objectives of each lab/field activity
1.9 Was knowledgeable about activities occurring in the lab/field
1.10 Facilitated learning during lab/field activities
1.11 Encouraged and responded to student questions
1.12 Treated students with respect
1.13 Overall, how would you rate this instructor?

Please continue on Page 2
2. Elaborate on your responses to PART 1:

2.1 List specific things the instructor has done especially well.

2.2 List specific things the instructor could do to improve his or her teaching effectiveness.

2.3 Were the a) textbook and b) field manual other written materials helpful in attaining the course objective? Explain.

2.4 Was this a challenging course? Explain.

2.5 Would you recommend to other students that they take this lecture/lab/field from this instructor? Briefly explain.
# The Instructor

The results of this questionnaire are important in the evaluation of teaching performance for **RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION** and **POST-TENURE** review made by departmental and university personnel committees. They are **ANONYMOUS** and are reviewed by your instructor only **AFTER** your grades have been submitted.

**PART 1:** Consists of nine statements pertaining to your instructor's teaching performance. Choose your response according to the following scale.

- **A** = Outstanding
- **B** = Very Good
- **C** = Good
- **D** = Fair
- **E** = Unacceptable
- **BLANK** = Insufficient basis to evaluate

### 1. Presented the objectives of the seminar course clearly.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Good</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unacceptable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Presented the objectives of the seminar course clearly.

1.2 Helped students to understand topics discussed.

1.3 Was knowledgeable about topics relevant to discussions.

1.4 Clarified theoretical or experimental principles.

1.5 Presented a well-organized course.

1.6 Provided effective and timely feedback on student performance.

1.7 Helped students to analyze relevant literature.

1.8 Treated students with respect.

1.9 Overall, how would you rate this instructor?

### 2. Elaborate your responses to **PART 1**

#### 2.1 List specific things the instructor has done especially well.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.2 List specific things the instructor could do to improve his or her teaching effectiveness.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue on Page 2
2. Elaborate your responses to PART 1 [Continue]

2.3 Were the reading materials useful in attaining the course objectives? Explain.

2.4 Was this a challenging experience? Explain.

2.5 Would you recommend to other students that they take this seminar from this instructor? Briefly explain.